

OFH 2 SESSION 1 Planning Inspectorate - East Anglia

Thu, 10/8 9:41AM • 1:36:00

00:04

Good afternoon, and welcome everybody to today's open floor hearing number two for East Anglia, one north and number two for East Anglia to offshore wind farms. This is the second pair of open floor hearings and these examinations. Now, before we introduce ourselves, I'll deal with a few preliminary matters, can I first check with the case team that you can hear me, I believe you can now and the recordings and the live streams have started.

00:33

Mr. Smith, I can confirm that the recording are stored in the live stream is working.

00:38

Thank you very much.

00:41

Now, I'm strongly conscious that not everybody who is requested to be heard has been able to speak today, yesterday, or indeed Friday. And if that's the case, and you're watching online or on this recording, rest assured, we will hear you there are more open floor hearings planned. And if you request it to be heard in October, but we're not listed to be heard, then, then you're already on the top of our list of speakers for our next round of hearings. And I will speak a little bit more about that. Later on in this introductory session. We're holding this hearing in two sessions. If you're here now, then you will be heard in this first session in the order shown in Annex A of the agenda. Once you have been heard, you don't need to stay. If you do, you can watch the rest of this session on the live stream. And you certainly don't need to join the second session. Again, if you want to see what's happening in that second session, please use the live stream to watch. By leaving and using the live stream you make sure that there's plenty of space in our computer systems for the speakers who urge you to follow on in session two. So two introductions. My name is Erin Smith, and I'm the lead member of a panel which is the examining authority for the East Anglia one offshore wind farm application. And another panel which is the examining authority for the East Anglia to offshore wind farm application. And I'll draw your attention to annex B of our rule six letter dated the 16th of July 2020, where you will find my brief biography and an explanation of the purpose of the examining authorities appointments and my declaration of interest. I will draw your attention to was made at the preliminary meetings part one on the 16th of September. My fellow panel members will now introduce themselves now flag that they too have brief biographies in annex b the rule six letter and they to make declarations at the preliminary meetings part one. So I'm going to start now by introducing Mrs. Caroline Jones.

02:49

afternoon everyone, my name is Caroline Jones, and today I am going to be leading on the main elements of this hearing.

02:59

Good afternoon everybody. My name is John Hockley, a member of these panels. I'll mainly be observing today and taking notes, but I may also ask questions if they arise. Thank you.

03:10

Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Jessica Powis. I'm a member of these panels. And I'll mainly be observing and taking notes this afternoon, but may ask questions if they arise.

03:22

Good afternoon, everyone. Guy Rigby be here also panel member for both of these panels. I may have questions, but my role today is primarily to observe and to take notes. If for any reason any of us is disconnected and unable to participate. Our deputy will act for us. So I'll now hand you back to Mr. Smith. Thank you.

03:45

Thank you very much, Mr. Rigby. I'll now briefly refer to our planning Inspectorate colleagues working with us on these examinations, some of whom you will already know under metal ready, and M Ray Williams and having Jones are jointly the case managers leading the planning Inspectorate case team for these applications. And Ray Williams led the arrangements conference and is managing the team today. And he is accompanied by two case officers Liam Fedden, and Louise Evans. Hopefully the agenda papers for these hearings have provided a clear explanation of our and your reasons for being here now, to hold open floor hearings. And these are your opportunity to raise anything that is important and relevant that you think we should know about and consider. Before we make any findings, or recommendations to the Secretary of State on either application for development consent. You will find information about the applications and documents produced for these examinations on the planning Inspectorate national infrastructure website. And this has a landing page for both projects and further pages that set out examination procedure, the timetable relevant representations and examination documents for each project separately. I will six letters that you will have received include the web addresses for these. I would urge you if you haven't already done so please do look at the website, because we'll be using using it to communicate with you and provide access to documents throughout both of these examinations. And very briefly, as I foreshadow going to remark about the process of requesting to be heard of these open floor hearings, and I'm conscious that some of the audience for these remarks as I'm going to make are not likely to be in the room with us today. But they may well be watching on the livestream, or on the catch up recording later. Any interested party who requests to be heard as an open floor hearing has a right to be heard at one, we have provided two rounds of requests to be heard. The first round of requests opened on the 18th of August using our open floor hearing involvement form on the websites. And this was for people requesting essentially to be heard right now, in this October round in these virtual hearings at the very beginning of the examinations. If people requested to be heard in this first round, I think it's fair to observe that they were oversubscribed. So what we have now done is we've added additional hearings in early November, open floor hearings four or five. And material will shortly be emerging on the website. And the rule eight letter will be published telling you more info meishan about those. Anybody who requests to be heard in the first round, but didn't find themselves with an appointment to be heard in October, will be included in the November

round of hearings. But I'll flag there is then a second round or opportunity of requests to be heard. These must be made by deadline one, the second of November, in the examination timetable. And that is the deadline for any other open floor hearings that we may hold after November. And that will include any of the to arrange with specific support, or in particular physical venue to provide for people who cannot use or access digital technology. And what we ask people that don't like one is that if there are reasons why they can't use digital technology that they set out in their request to be heard at that point, and the assistance that they seek. There are however, some general principles that apply to everyone who requests to be heard as an open floor hearing. And the first of these is that if people have technical difficulties attending a hearing that they thought they were due to attend, then we do ask them to please speak to the case, team, by telephone, if the email isn't working, and the case team will always do their best to get you involved again, as soon as they can. However, other than where things go wrong with technology, we are in many ways a little bit like the National Health Service, we're a public service, if people don't keep appointments without good reason. And that results in time in hearings not being used, then there is in principle, an issue because there are lots and lots of people in this locality who really want to use that time. And so if the time is lost, because somebody who booked an appointment, didn't use it, essentially. And that is creating difficulty for those who follow after them. So what I do wish to make clear is that if somebody does fail to attend an open floor hearing without good reason or explanation, then our starting point is that we have already given them a reasonable opportunity to be heard. And so in those circumstances, if there weren't any technical problems, then I'm afraid we will have to ask them to make their subsequent contributions in writing.

08:41

Okay, then that's the end of my introductory opening remarks, you know, who we are and why we're here. And so I'm now going to hand you over to Mrs. Jones, who will lead the majority of this hearing, Mrs. Jones.

08:58

Thank you very much, Mr. Smith. This is Caroline Jones, panel member speaking. Shortly, I'll be asking attendees for session one, to speak in the order, set out an agenda and Annex A of the agenda. But before I do, there are just a few things to remember. We advise you in the agenda that we are being live streamed and recorded. The recordings that we make are retained and published. Therefore, they form a public record that can contain your personal information to which the general data protection regulation applies. Does anyone have any questions about the terms on which for digital recordings are made? not seeing any hands raised or hearing anybody so we will move forward on the basis that this is all understood. My colleague Mr. Williams has provided me with a list of speakers for session one and the running order as confirmed in the arrangements conference. open floor hearings are an opportunity for individuals and community groups to speak directly to the examining authorities and not about a particular location or topic. The topic of your representations about the profession. is therefore up to yourself. However, we may disregard representation if it is vexatious or frivolous. I would also like to reiterate that the examining authority are very conscious that not everyone who has requested to be heard, has been able to speak today or yesterday or Friday. To assist in this situation. We confirmed on Tuesday the preliminary meeting that we will hold a further two meetings at the beginning of November, and further hearings in January by anyone who hasn't been heard. In our initial series of hearings, either the ones being held this week, or next month will be heard. So turning to this evening's meeting,

you know, the order that I intend to take speakers in on the agenda sets out the speaking time guides that apply, so you know, when you are likely to speak, please do not leave until you've had your turn as if you do we are fully booked in the hearings this week, and we will be able to include you in a later session. Once you have spoken, we will ask you to leave to ensure that there is enough capacity in the system for the latest speakers to join, you can listen to and watch the remainder of the hearing on the live stream. I should also say that I will need to be quite strict in terms of the timings this evening due to the number of speakers that we have, so that everyone has the opportunity to speak. So please do not be offended if I have to ask you to stop talking at the end of your allotted time. If you have more to say after this, then you're very welcome to submit such thoughts in writing for deadline one. Could I just check the name of the contact that we have for the applicants today please?

11:30

Yes. Good afternoon, Madam. Thank you. Colin in us on our from Shaftner Wedderburn on behalf of the applicants. I'm joined on the link with Stephanie mill, also from shaftner Wedderburn here today I'm also instructed by Fiona Kyle of SPR Legal. And also have within the room rich Maurice, Senior Project Manager and Leslie Jameson project manager. Thank you.

11:58

Thank you very much. Good afternoon, Can I just remind you that the main purpose of this evening is to hear from interested parties and that you are here to listen in the main before I close the hearing. This afternoon, I will give you a brief opportunity in session to to make responding remarks on matters that you consider must be drawn to our attention. Please confine these to five minutes if you can, and detailed responses can be provided in writing at deadline one. Anyone who is speaking in this session can watch that response on the live stream. Finally, can I just remind everybody that this is an opportunity for everyone here to have their say, in fairness, just as you would not wish to be interrupted, please do not interrupt the other speakers. If you agree with or disagree with what they say, then you can make that clear to us in your own speaking time. Or if you've already spoken or watching on the live stream, then you can do so in writing it deadline one, and we will take your views into account. Every speaker should be allowed the floor and their time to speak. Just to reminder this juncture that deadline is the second of November 2020. So there is plenty of time available to submit your views in writing. If anybody does interrupt this afternoon, then I will warn them and ask them to allow the hearing to continue. If the same person interrupts again, I will warn them again and be aware repeated interruptions that lead to disruption can be used can be viewed as unreasonable behavior for which awards of costs can be sought by other interested parties. If anyone interrupts again, following two warnings, on the third occasion, I will ask the case manager to exclude them from the hearing. So that's the introduction is now complete. Before I move on to the main business of session one does anyone have any questions or an introductory or preliminary nature that need to be resolved. Now? I'm not seeing any hands raised. So we will move to agenda item two. Before I introduce our first speaker this afternoon, I will let you know that it's our intention to provide everybody with a clean run. You've no doubt prepared what you have to say and you don't want to be interrupted saying it. We will listen to you carefully and if my colleagues or I have questions, we will raise those at the end of your speaking time. So the first speaker I have this afternoon is the Right Honourable MP

14:21

t coffey Do we have you

14:24

there? Yes. Hello We can see and hear you such a coffey you have 10 minutes in which to make your points Mr. Williams will let you know with a slide after five minutes that you're halfway through. And then again when you have one minute left. And if when you begin your contribution if you could introduce yourself that would be helpful. Okay, buddy whenever you are.

14:46

Thank you very much. I'm Tereza coffee a Member of Parliament for Suffolk coastal. I speak in relation to the two development consent order applications as the onshore infrastructure required to facilitate them. It's for both wind farms, not just one notably the cabling running westward from fatness to connect to the new substations proposed at Kristen. At the outset, I wish to reinforce my support for the principle of zero carbon and renewable electricity generation. I was Environment Minister when the government first made the commitment to have net zero carbon emissions by 2050, some of which will be by reduced reliance on fossil fuel generated generated electricity and the enhancement of nature based measures. The UK already has much offshore wind capacity, and as was announced by the Prime Minister this week, more is planned right around the country by the end of this decade. particularly in light of this, I strongly suggest that the planning Inspectorate and the Secretary of State should be considering these two applications in light of the cumulative impact of future applications, several of which have already been granted a connection point in this geographic area. Not only is this justified by the recent announcement, but also that this is exactly what the government said they would do in their document, industrial strategy offshore sector windy, published in March 2019. When they said in their plans to work with developers, they would address strategic deployment issues, including onshore and offshore transmission, cumulative environmental impacts, both in the Marine and onshore areas. The government reinforced this in the same strategy plan on page 28, stating and reference the program for deployment of offshore wind for up to 2030, which expects to be done in a sustainable and timely way. And to quote in partnership with the government and in collaboration with the devolved administration's regulators, developers, operators, statutory nature, conservation bodies, and nongovernmental organizations. The program's aim will be to increase the evidence base and understanding of offshore wind deployment, both in the Marine area and weather associated onshore impacts to support sustainable and coordinated expansion of offshore wind. Turning now to the two applications, I have no specific objection to that offshore elements that they will need to meet the appropriate environmental assessment requirements, which I appreciate have been strengthened under this government. As we do more to protect the natural marine environment. There is understandably a great deal of irritation. That decisions are developers to apply for wind farms with DC connections, then switch to AC connections, which leads to much greater demand for onshore infrastructure. The key issue then in both these applications is how best to connect these strategic offshore energy sites to the National Grid. Throughout the consultation stages, I have suggested alternatives to scottishpower renewables, including the proposed nuclear brownfield site at Bradwell, which would have meant less onshore cabling and substations in a more appropriate location. Sp I've chosen not to see that which in my view would have made their applications acceptable, and are instead proposing a 32 meter wide cabling corridor across nine kilometers of sensitive landscape with large substations on the edge of Friston village without adequate landscaping. The size and scale of

the substations proposed at Friston will have a devastating impact on the local environment, including on local listed buildings, which surround the substation site. Paragraph 151 of the national planning policy framework, states that plans for renewable energy should ensure that adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily including cumulative landscape and visual impacts. SPR submission does not do that, especially when you consider all the other energy infrastructure, which has been planned with this part of the Suffolk coast. This was the point made by the large number of people who attended my public meeting, which goes to show the strength of feeling locally. There is also a danger the substation will need to be even bigger than planned. Why understand is the intention to use SF six sulfur hexafluoride for cooling rather than their cooling significantly reduce the size of the power stations. This cannot be taken for granted. Given the government's ratification of various amendments, the Montreal Protocol and the Kyoto Protocol, which aims to reduce significantly the use of fluorinated gases, as if released, they are very potent greenhouse gases. sf six is the most potent greenhouse gas approximately 23,000 times the effect of carbon dioxide on global warming. The alternative of using air cooled infrastructure is much much larger, approximately six times the size a substation would be needed and would be a far worse outcome. When SPR first proposed Friston as a site for substations, but I do not think at an appropriate site. I was clear that at the very minimum on the basis of planning conditions, if the Inspectorate was minded to recommend the DCR be granted that she could take them into the ground to reduce the visual impact. This does not form part of their plans and their proposed planting to screen the development is woefully inadequate, especially when you take into consideration the growth rates of their landscaping mitigation. If the Inspectorate is minded to approve this application and to recommend To the Secretary of State, I strongly suggest that they apply such conditions such that the effective height of the building will be no more than a standard three storey house, and that more mature trees would be needed for mitigation. The answer on landscaping mitigation would not just be laid on by conifers, but should be at least mixed hardwood and softwood and would need to be in line with the UK forestry standard. And the requirements that the environmental regulators propose cabling does not comply with paragraph 151 of the nppf either, as instead of facilitating a connection to the grid as close to shore as possible. The proposal for nine kilometers of underground cabling will cause a significant impact on the landscape, including elements of the amb and the removal of a section of protected woodland close to ordering and court agreed to list a building, I understand that the width of the cable route will be reduced to 16.1 meters at sensitive locations. But despite that, will also cause the loss of a number of hedgerows interspersed by significant trees. This is in direct opposition to paragraph 170 of the nppf which calls for the protection and enhancement of valued landscapes. I'm also really concerned about the proximity of the cabling corridor to residential properties and have received correspondence from concerned constituents about the impact it will have locally. There are no details about how these words will be managed. There are also concerns about how the cabling comes on short thought ness, and the impact of drilling on the stabilization of the cliffs also have significant concerns about the economic aspect of these proposals and the impact it will have on our tourism industry. The disruption the onshore infrastructure will cause during the development phase, and the lasting impact on the beauty of this part of Suffolk will have an impact on visitor numbers and the livelihoods of local residents. Apart from the initial construction, there were absolutely no local jobs associated with this onshore infrastructure in the medium to long term even in the short term. My biggest concern though continues to be the extent of which the cumulative impact of other energy infrastructure projects are also being taken into account. This is a key point in terms of site selection, and on which myself and other parliamentary colleagues are actively lobbying government ministers.

Earlier this summer, the energy minister led him to announce an offshore transmission network review into how offshore energy firms bring their electricity back onshore to the national grid and how the planning system deals with that, as part of that review, National Grid are now suggesting integrated connections rather looking at onshore infrastructure in isolation. They state that there are significant environmental and environmental benefits to an integrated approach as the number of onshore landing points could potentially be reduced by around 50%. They also suggest that the majority of the technology required for integrated design is available now. Even more recently, proposals are being actively discussed and considered about offshore integration methods to minimize further on short landing points. While I'm conscious people in London may look to this area given our energy density. The very fact that we have a precious A and B and surrounding countryside should make it obvious that for future energy needs, where there isn't already an established sizeable cluster in terms of energy generation, as may be considered to be the case with nuclear generation, that this area should not become the energy dumping ground for onshore infrastructure. I recognize that regulatory and legislative changes may need to be made to enact this, but I feel strongly that this new emerging policy framework should at least be considered. In fact, the review report states that some changes to achieve an integrated network can take place within the current regime. I want to recognize the efforts made by local councillors and local residents that have been meticulous and deciduous and making their case to me and to these planning applications. And I do encourage the planning inspectors and ministers to fully consider their detailed representations made in the interest in natural environment, and why this application is not the correct way to achieve the overall outcome we want. And actually this could be done better. And in conclusion, the impact of this proposal on the countryside, vital habitats, heritage assets, immunities of local residents and tourism means that I formally object to these DC applications. And I urge the planning Inspectorate not to recommend them to the Secretary state, rather that they are refused. I want to thank the panel for the opportunity to have made my submission. And as I have unconscious that others wish to speak, and I need to attend to other parliamentary duties. Thank you.

24:22

Thank you very much, Dr. Coffey. That was a very helpful and submission just before you go. And my colleague, Mr. Smith, would like to ask you a question if that's all right.

24:34

Indeed. Well, I think I I just wanted to firstly give you an element of reassurance Dr. Coffey given that you may be didn't follow the discussion that took place in the preliminary meetings, but you'll be aware that there was a substantial discussion about the relevance of the BS transmission review. And for these examinations. We've made the decision to proceed with these examinations in the timescale that we do because as you will be you We'll be well aware, government is typically reviewing almost any aspect of any decision at almost any time, and that if we stopped for review, we would potentially stop forever. However, we are strongly alive to the fact that interim recommendations may emerge from that review within the timescale of our examinations. And that also, our reports will end up on the table of the Secretary of State B's alongside the outcomes from that review. And we can therefore emphasize the importance of the outcomes of all of these processes mapping together in the mind of the Secretary of State. And the second quick question that I wanted to put to you is that you have made a number of references to the National Planning policy framework, which is, of course, an important and relevant consideration in added operations. But we are also statutorily required to decide these applications in

accordance with the National Policy Statement strategy, particularly NPS, n one, and NPS n three, they are the equivalent of our Bible, their development plan that we have to have regard to and that the Secretary of State is required to have regard to as the primary source of policy. And essentially what I was going to ask if you could do by deadline, one is relate some of the observations that you made in relation to nppf compliance back to the relevant components of the national policy statements. Because yes, we will consider the format. But we have to record the latter, higher status, and I thought it was important before you left this session today, but thank you very much for your contribution.

26:36

Thank you, Mr. Smith. I'll certainly do that. I wonder what happens if the new MPs comes out in between, but we'll see.

26:44

And that's one of our big challenges. But you know, as I've indicated to everybody what we will deal with the newest the new arrives.

26:53

Okay, thank you very much, everybody.

26:55

Thank you very much, you.

27:00

Okay, so I'm going to move on to our second speaker this afternoon. And that is counselor Marianne fellowes for over town council, Counselor fellowes.

27:21

Hello, can you see me? Okay.

27:23

Hello, again, counsel. If I can hear and see you. Fine. Thank you very much. Just to let you know that you have 10 minutes in which to make your points this afternoon. Again, Mr. Williams will let you know with a slide after five minutes. And again, when you have one minute left, if you could just remember to introduce yourself when you commence that would be very useful for the recording.

27:45

Okay, thank you. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, Marion fellowes Aldeburgh town counselor, Mr. Smith, Miss Jones panel members, thank you for this opportunity to address you, representing 3000 plus residents plus another one or 2000 visitors. a diverse range of businesses organizations could be an impossible task. In fact, in 10 minutes, that's a few seconds for everybody. But actually, it's quite an easy task. Because Olga is not just an affluent group of retirees frequent clean our large seaside brand name shops. We also have many families, individuals working in tourism, restaurants or lifeboat postcards, supermarkets, libraries, hospitals, the GP surgery, our cinema and shops. But we are of one mind, and that is the balance of harm that these two applications pros outweighs any benefit,

and it should be rejected. It's against 10 point 10 04 point seven of the Energy Act 2004. And principles that offshore developments should not cause considerable irreparable damage to coastal communities and the environment. The environmental impact assessment is supposed to consider the impact caused of these projects from the construction, running and decommissioning of them. I've looked through the applicants materials, and there's nothing about the decommissioning in 25 3035 years time. All the town council hopes are holding these hearings virtually will not hinder you from gaining the true picture. If you were here in person, I think you'd have probably stayed overnight. You traveled the same roads that we can talk about, you would experience the tranquility that we feel so passionately about. Obertan castle was one of more than 40 town or parish councils that wrote to the Secretary of State, such as the weight of our joined up and and shared views and concerns. I'd also like you remember that 848 people sent in relevant representations over 140 asked to speak open floor hearings. Compare that to Senate where you had no one asking Speaker overflow hearings and Vanguard where you only had 276 relevant representations. This application before you is for the National Grid substation for eight projects in one node EA to Nautilus euro link greater gobert extension galloper extension now renamed five vestries.

A new North falls. It's also SCD one and SCD two potentially, as you heard yesterday, there's no innovative thinking. Everything has been duplicated in the infrastructure VA one, two and a one north. For the other six, it would have to follow as well. Every project likely to be set from Friston would need substations cable runs landfills, if you had a map in front of you right now, and drew a radius out of five kilometers, which is three miles and then a circle round. That's the area where the 16 cable runs would have to navigate obras only four miles from Friston, it would be within that small area. National Grid and they're relevant representation confirmed that these projects will come here. In fact, two of them Nautilus and euro link already have confirmed offers of connections. The community of impact assessment and the environmental assessments do not include these because the applicant says there's inadequate detail yet to the presentation in July 2019. over town council was told that the Secretary of State had confirmed in April 2019, that Nautilus would be an ncip and would have a DCO submitted in 2022, with construction schedule for 2024. And one is supposed to be constructed in 2025, and 224. So these are all on the table and should be considered. And we hope you'll reflect these in your recommendation, and that there's a real failure to plan strategically and to future proof.

There's already a interconnector for Belgium to the UK called NEEMO, which began operation in 2019. Only last year, why is Nautilus needed but Belgium? Why was it not future proofed and as you heard yesterday, it was only to reduce costs SPR reduce voltage and brand food was not been able to take em on North Korea in two. And we have this application before us. Today is world clean air day. And Arbor town council trust that you will accept the expert evidence in the relevant representations and what will be provided to you in the issue specific hearings from organizations that are far more knowledgeable than us. And we support their submissions. We would note that in all the applicants assessments, they have minimized the harm and just noise traffic. For example, they say that traffic noise impact will be no greater than that of minor magnitude resulting in the impacts of no greater than a minor adverse significance. But when you consider magnitude, you have to think of the baseline a buzz, a switch in the night is lost in an urban area, but startling in a quiet rural setting where there is silence, decibel our relative uses of measurement. But did you know that naught, which is quiet 10 times that is 10 decibels, but 100 times is 20 and 30 decibels is 1000 times nothing or quiet. And on

page 90, the applicant admits that the limit at Friston will be equal or no greater than 134 decibels. For operational noise that's 1000 times greater than naught, not just 34 times the human ear is so clever. You can even hear when you touch your hair. I want y'all to do that now and you'll hear that noise. So sound is based on where it comes from. to start with. Please don't believe the applicant when they say it's negligible the impact. There are too many variations, cable routes, they are typically 32 meters wide, we're told, but then if you read on they could be up to 90 to cross the lacing over sssi 50 meters to cross the river hundred or hundred 90 meters for a wider separation between transition bays whatever they are, I still haven't got my head around what that is in my research. So there's too many variations. working hours could be seven to seven. But then there's a long list of exceptions which includes words that can't safely be stopped addition to started it, they can't stop it within seven to seven, seven in the morning and seven at night. It has to continue until two or three in the morning. There's absolutely no benefits which outweigh harm. If you look at jobs the applicant in their comments and irrelevant representation confirms that only 36 of the 249 jobs the equivalent full time equivalent 167 will be local and that can be up to 16 minutes drive away. 42 miles is Colchester Braintree is 55 Lowestoft is well within that limit, so why not have the work of Lowestoft and all the infrastructure there. In fact, he am one laws is 36 kilometers directly offload stuff that would be more appropriate. Please remember that the population of Friston is only 344.

In terms of the benefits to the economy, there is none. But there's certainly many risks in the tourism economy. And you will see the destination management organization report the key word there is destination for a destination. We have to have roads free, we have to have accommodation free for people to be able to come here and the tranquility that they're coming for still needs to be here. 26 public rights away are going to be temporary stopped up or diverted and to permanently lost. And remember, that's just to end on one loss and end to not alone the others to follow. There's a huge concern about roads. And I'll submit that in writing. But just briefly, there's already dangerous junctions. We had fatalities I know of people, families who lost loved ones. There's too sensitive to talk about that today. But the 810 94 Junction on Friday Street was where one of the malls further down on the 1894 closer to Oprah was another we must avoid this danger. The applicant has said to avoid the dangerous roundabout in obrah. They're going to propose that all deliveries travel first to a construction consolidation site, which they're going to build off the B 1069, which is a very small road from Black Keys corner, an accident black spot to non issue. vehicles traveling through the amb will destroy it. There's also impacts to our fishing industry and over concerns about the Coraline crag intrusion, disruption of the seabed sediment. It's really inappropriate to talk about that in any great lengths because I know you have expert guidance from the marine management organization and the fisheries industry. So just in conclusion today, in assessing the magnitude of harm minimal is where the probability and the magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the proposal is not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily lives of the general population. The eo MP we must protect their own It stands for outstanding action was the last sentence I lost.

My last sentence actions can be considered harmful to the a&b if it results in the loss of or material harm to any of the components of character that combined to form the area's natural beauty and of its constraints, or the achievement of the AONB management plan objectives. So, in terms of the amb roads, all of the harms that you look at in issue specific examinations, over town council are one view.

And that is the all of over is that the disc benefits outweigh the benefits of this project. The harm is too great. The cost to the environment in our economy. Our lives is too. Great.

38:58

Thank you.

38:59

Thank you very much. Very helpful information. And they're just two matters. I would like to raise with you in in your submissions, you referred to the Energy Act 2004. And also a tourism report. Yes, good. Yeah. Could I ask that you ensure that in your written representation to be submitted to deadline one, that you give us the full citation and references to both those documents?

39:29

Yes, I will. Miss Jones, you do already have the destination mansion organization report. And I will I outline in one in three and five, which I've referred to today. And I will do that in writing for you. And also the horlock rules, which says that you should not be disturbing the triple sssr I will include that for you. Thank you so much.

39:53

Thank you very much. Mr. Hockley. Did you have something you'd like to mention?

39:57

Uh, yes. Thank you, Mrs. Jones. It's just a point of clarification and reassurance really that, obviously, and I know you've probably been aware of discounts or photos, but also for everybody else listening in is that we are carrying out some socially distant site inspections. We've carried out free so far. And we will be having another one so soon as we continue to gain knowledge of your area.

40:20

Yes, I know that you've asked to receive by November the second specific instructions as to where it would be helpful to stand and spend time. My comments about you not being here overnight, is that a visit of just two hours on an area set 10 o'clock in the morning or two o'clock in the afternoon is not going to give you what I want you to see. I want you to stand out there at 10 o'clock at night and look up at the moon and see the stars and hear nothing. Okay, thank you.

40:50

Yes, no, no, no, it's noted. And I'll just all our sizes so far. I've actually been overnight as well. And our next one will as well be overnight as well. So I'll certainly take you up on that offer. So thank you very much, council fellows.

41:03

Thank you. Thank you, Councillor fellowes. Our third speaker is Councillor Craig rivet for his Suffolk Council.

41:17

Good afternoon, everyone.

41:20

Good afternoon, Counselor, have a second here and see well, excellent counselor, but you also have 10 minutes in which to make your your points this afternoon Mr. Williams will give you a reminder at five minutes and then again, when you have one minute remaining.

41:35

Thank you ever so much.

41:37

If I could just remind you to introduce yourself and your speaking Is that a fair recording?

41:41

Certainly will do. So good afternoon, everyone. I'm Craig rivet deputy leader of East Suffolk District Council. So we would like to thank the examining authority for the opportunity to speak and for the opportunity provided to local residents to express their views. The comments of the examining authority during the preliminary meeting have been noted and therefore I will try to be as concise as possible. Is Suffolk council recognizes the role of offshore wind and other low carbon energy sources are set to play in helping the UK to achieve a carbon neutral economy by 2050. We support this ambition and fully recognize the contribution is Suffolk will make by virtue of its geographical proximity to advantageous offshore seabed conditions and kinetic onshore electrical infrastructure. We are currently facing uncertain times and it is recognized that offshore wind development can contribute to the post COVID-19 economic recovery both locally and nationally. The offshore wind industry provides a big opportunity for Lowestoft in terms of job creation and inward investment, which has been seen with the construction of the East Anglian one operations and maintenance base in the town. However, these benefits do not mean that the offshore wind industry should be supported at any cost. At present, there is a worrying lack of coordination between the major infrastructure projects in the area, which is a fundamental concern of the District Council. We've been working with Suffolk County Council to strive for a more coordinated approach major energy infrastructure. The current uncoordinated and piecemeal approach taken by developers results in significant and unnecessary impacts on local communities and the environment, which could be avoided or reduced. The current projects are unfortunately an example of this, it is welcomed that the same onshore order limits are proposed for both projects and that the off onshore infrastructure will be co located. However, it is disappointing that the applicants cannot consolidate the onshore development by sharing infrastructure, committing to simultaneous construction of the projects or if constructed and sequentially committing to one project laying the ducting for the second. These measures would all help to reduce the environmental impacts of the projects, which will inevitably be to the detriment of the local community. We understand that greater coordination would be possible.

As an example the consented East Anglia one project promoted by scottishpower renewables provided the ducting for the later East Anglia three project. Another major concern for the Suffolk Council is the lack of coordination in relation to the grid connection processes. We understand the grid connection regime may be outside of the scope of examination, but the lack of coordination in that process results

in consequences and impacts which are within the scope of the examination. The National Grid substation is proposed under the current DC applications is also identified as the point of connection for a further three other projects, the Nautilus interconnector Euroland interconnector and Galaxy extension now known as the five vestries wind farm. This means the National Grid substation proposed by these application applications will need to be enlarged to accommodate these further connections. And there will be further substations in the vicinity of Friston associated with these other projects. However, East Anglia, one North and East Anglia two applications do not consider those future projects and therefore, the full impact of the construction of the National Grid substation of Friston. We know which we know what needs to be extended have not been explained to the examining authority. The development of the substations will result in long lasting impacts on the landscape, character and views surrounding the site and village of Friston. Where the substations are located. The village benefits from several heritage assets and historic features, including a public right of way along a former hundred boundary, which contributes to its historic landscape, character and sense of place. Many features and assets will unfortunately be adversely affected or lost. He suffered canceled consider that the examination into East Anglia, one North and East Anglia two should take into account the likely effects arising from these projects and others in the pipeline that will inevitably add or exacerbate the impacts on Friston. In addition to visual concerns the effect of the long term operational noise is a key concern for the local authority. Friston is a small rural village, it is important not to underestimate the impact the development of these projects will have on the local community.

46:32

The offshore impacts should not be forgotten, with the applications resulting in significant long term impacts on the special qualities of the area of outstanding natural beauty is Suffolk Council has set out its current position in relation to the East Anglia, one north and east Angular two applications in their relevant representation. We have identified our support for the principle of offshore wind, but make clear that this must not be at any cost. There is insufficient time available today to go through the matters in detail and highlight every aspect of the applications where we have raised concerns. This is the purpose of the issue specific hearings and our local impact report. We have been working closely with Suffolk County Council and therefore to avoid repetition, I will leave traffic and transport public rights of way drainage and archaeological matters to the county to discuss. A presentation opposition remains as set out in the council's relevant representations. We object to the overall impact of the onshore substations and raise significant concerns regarding the effects of the offshore turbines on the area of outstanding natural beauty. Our role in this examination is to raise our concerns with the examining authority and to seek to protect the interests of the local community, rather than to determine the applications. We recognize that the Secretary of State is the decision maker. In the event that consent is granted, we would want to ensure that there are sufficient commitments secured within the DCO to ensure the applicants strive to reduce the impacts of the project's post consent through the design refinement works. If approved, with a worst case Rochdale envelope, the applicants should commit to trying to achieve the best case, particularly in terms of the scale and noise output from the substations. We will however, continue to work with the applicants in order to try and secure appropriate mitigation in relation to the impacts of the projects, whilst recognizing in some circumstances this may not be possible, and therefore appropriate compensation is being sought. Thank you so much.

48:36

Thank you very much can serve it?

48:39

I believe my colleague, Mr. Smith would like to ask you a question just before you go.

48:47

Thank you very much, Counselor Revitt. In fact, the question isn't directed at you it is a hook from a matter that you raised, which I'm laying on the table to essentially ask the applicant to ensure that they respond to their deadline one submissions and Councillor rivett did raise two quite significant issues. Firstly. The cable infrastructure sharing between the East Anglia one and East Anglia three projects and essentially raising the logic the logical concern, is there any potential for such an approach to be taken with these two projects? And if not, why not? So it'd be very useful if the applicant could respond to that deadline one. Secondly, and this emerges from councilor rivets, comments but does emerge also from a number of the comments of the other speakers so far this afternoon. And concerns about the degree to which the national grid connection will facilitate a range of other projects making connection to the transmission system of this location and the proposition A range of other connection offers have already been proffered by national grid. One of the matters that we need to have a care about here is in relation to compulsory acquisition and whether or not the site sought by the applicant, in this instance, has a justification in terms of land requirement for its particular needs. And the compulsory acquisition system can be somewhat tricky and a little strict about circumstances where strategic needs for additional projects or proposals not yet fully in train are being thought about. So again, what we would ask the applicant to turn their minds to is this idea of the specific justification for compulsory acquisition in these circumstances and whether or not there is any possibility of access or over acquisition of land or rights Friston because we will need to be clearly persuaded that what is being sorted for us and is justified by this specific project, even if we were minded and to make a positive recommendation. So I'll leave that with the applicant. Thank you very much, though, cancel the road for raising those points. Give us much

51:15

thank you cancer of it. And we look forward to receiving a specific Council's local impact report as well.

51:24

Thank you.

51:27

Okay, our next speaker this afternoon is Richard rout for Suffolk County Council.

51:36

Good afternoon.

51:39

Good afternoon, Mr. Rout. You also have 10 minutes this afternoon and we'll get a reminder once you have reached five minutes and again when you have one minute remaining.

51:50

Thank you very much.

51:51

Please begin when you're ready.

51:53

Good afternoon. My name is Richard Rout, and I'm the cabinet member for Environment and Public Protection at the county council. We've heard from my colleagues at Suffolk Council about their views on the submitted DCO applications. Suffolk County Council shares similar concerns although for the sake of not repeating these, I will mainly concentrate on those aspects for which the county council has a remit. Suffolk County Council declared a climate emergency in March 2019. And followed this ordinance is seeking to achieve carbon neutrality both as a county council and more broadly across Suffolk by 2030, which will require significant action involving a range of stakeholders. It's acknowledged by the county council that offshore wind farms will make a significant contribution towards meeting this goal. Coastal communities in Suffolk and other parts of the UK have suffered disproportionately economically over recent decades. And the county council is making significant efforts to revitalize these communities. The iconic new Goldwing Bridge to be delivered by the lake loading third crossing development consent order Lowestoft is an exemplar project in this regard. It's also acknowledged that offshore wind farms provide a significant economic boost to these communities during construction and in the longer term during the operation and maintenance phase. As part of the proposals, onshore berry cables and substations will be required. In particular, the substation at Preston will no doubt be the center stage in the forthcoming proceedings. It is in the evaluation and scrutiny of these aspects of the proposals that the county council has the biggest part to play. In particular, the county Council's remit in respect of highways, public rights of way, archaeology, and as lead local flood authority means it has the knowledge and expertise on these matters. Inevitably there are some negative aspects to the development, which requires suitable and satisfactory mitigation in order to be acceptable.

Although it is acknowledged that mitigation is embedded in the development center applications, the county council is of the view that in many cases it does not go far enough. Officers have engaged heavily with the applicants with a view to improving the mitigation put forward, and the county council looks forward to later technical sessions at the examination where detailed issues can be explored. The key issue of remaining concerns include the following. As proposed the level of HDTV traffic required to construct and decommission the substation Hall Road would result in the existing A1094 and a 12 Junction arrangement being unsafe. The mitigation proposed in the DCO application of reducing the speed limit controlled by an existing speed camera and improving road markings and signage is inadequate. The cable route and substation development will result in permanent loss of public right of way, which also forms the 1000 year old parish boundary and affords views of Preston Church. There's a bit of DCO proposals in no way offering an alternative solution. The cable route would also cause a significant adverse impact on public rights of way between landfall and the substation. With no real compensator or public rights of way being proposed elsewhere. The DCO order limits a tightly drawn in certain areas where the archaeology the archaeological importance has not been assessed

55:36

properly.

55:38

If features of significant archaeological importance were found in these areas, the deliverability of the cable routes in that alignment might not be possible. If the preservation in situ was required. The application, the applicant points to difficulties in obtaining landowner permission, but with respect this does not overcome the issue. In 2019, Preston experienced a significant flood event including flooding of dwellings, although obviously the applicant cannot be held responsible for these events. Unfortunately, the existing DCA proposals for the management of surface water from the proposed substation site, they to the extent that it's not possible to ascertain if they're acceptable. It would be remiss of me not to mention an issue that has been of great concern. With all concerned locally with these proposals. Suffolk is expected to host the land full of a significant amount of the government's ambitious offshore wind farm expansion targets of achieving 40 gigawatts by 2030. And currently, there's 10 gigawatts. With these two dcl applications, the substation would form a connection opportunity for other offshore wind farm connector schemes currently in the pipeline. The department that business energy and industrial strategy is currently reviewing how such schemes should be connected. And it's our firm belief that it would have been preferable for these schemes to be included within that review. As it is any outputs of the review will need to be need to feed into the examination as and when they emerge. Finally, the proposed new nuclear Sizewell CDCR application proposes a bass project, which will have significant impact on the local area, and only serves to exacerbate the issue of issues including highways and potential impacts on the tourism trade. So cumulative effects will therefore need to be carefully assessed. Thus, whilst the county council welcomes the proposal because of both the renewable energy benefits and the economic opportunities they bring, it does, it does have some serious areas of concern with regard to the impact of the proposals and how they are currently intended to be addressed. The county council very much hopes that the examination process will enable a win win solution to be achieved for the environment economy and for Suffolk. Thank you.

58:06

Thank you very much. Councillor rout. Could I just refer back to the comments that you made in relation to flooding in Friston? It would be really helpful and with Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council is the lead local flood authority if you could provide us with as much information as possible, in terms of that that flooding that has occurred and Friston if we could get that within the local in your local impact report. That would be really helpful.

58:32

I'll ensure that so that's it.

58:34

Thank you very much. Thank you.

58:38

Okay, the next speaker on my list is Mr. Paul Carlaw.

58:44

Good Good afternoon. Yes.

58:47

Hello, Mr. Carlaw. Yes, I can see and hear you there. Mr. Carlaw, you have five minutes this afternoon. And Mr. Williams, will put a reminder when you have one minute remaining. Thank you very much. Just Introduce yourself before you speak.

59:02

Thank you. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Paul Carlaw, and I'm a local resident Friston have lived in Suffolk for 27 years. Firstly, I'd like to congratulate the team on the way these hearings are being conducted. And so far, I've not missed one minute of the live stream, which goes to show how the the strength of feeling in the village and the entire sort of coastal region to deliver green energy have strategically rather than creating ad hoc and irreparable damage to such a beautiful historic area. Secondly, I support the views of the other people who have commented, opposing the development, particularly the onshore part of this development. And I support the views of the various groups, cc C's and parish Council. Just so you know, you're aware My background is in construction projects. And I've been involved in a number of planning appeals in the past. So to wake up from what felt like a nightmare to hear that this proposal to develop a Greenfield site. So close to the village It was quite astonishing to me. It wasn't that long ago when the government was almost mandating the use of brownfield sites for development. So why are we here today discussing such a huge development is my question. I moved to Suffolk because of its tranquil and tranquil a beautiful place that attracted many people and tourists for centuries, because of its natural dark skies, wildlife coastal paths. We heard this last night, but it's absolutely true. So I want to mention it again. And I just say if I decided to live on the outskirts of Gatwick or Heathrow Airport, I would expect noise and disruption. That's not the case here in Suffolk, there isn't any sensible reason to look at an industrial development so close to local people. The main reason why we're here today. Having this review is due to the lack of strategic thinking on behalf of the applicant. Why our SPR and National Grid not working together to come up with a green energy solution that reduces environmental impact on the community. why they're not looking at by looking so many interconnectors at the same site. These are questions that needs to be addressed. I'm going to list out the reasons for my objection, below. But they're not an exhaustive list. Firstly, inappropriate site selection. All I remember a couple of years ago was seeing an extract from an Ordnance Survey map, which showed a few circles on proposed sites, none of which were appropriate. This was virtually sprung upon the local people. And a lot of the applicant went through the consultation process, there's been almost no changes to the proposed development. The loss of agricultural land as well and rural views that was really important to everyone in this area. One of the most significant points which has been raised, but I do have to mention, again, is our roads and transport. The roads are too small for such a major development. In some instances, they're almost too small to that one large vehicle and the car to pass, forcing vehicles under the grass verge, let alone hgvs. They're also built for rural use, and not construction traffic. It's dangerous, and this cannot be mitigated. And the loss of historic public footpaths, they're all used locally and by tourists alike. We're going to want to walk who's going to want to walk past such an unsightly development and future. Flooding, as we

mentioned, I mentioned again, already have problems in the village, the bears review the cumulative impact so many projects in this region. I think everyone has mentioned this review. And that's why it's so important to be taken into account. If the plans are approved and allowed to proceed, then the impact will be significant. noise. This is a huge concern, not only during construction, but in the future. The land is flat and the noise travels. I've noticed and one of SPS documents they mentioned piling and piling rig, which apparently emits 118 decibels, what sort of life is going to be left for local people with the third third of the pile drivers and the noise of this moving plans construction traffic and materials being delivered. 18 and a half meter height unsightly buildings will destroy this region and the local village. This can be mitigated with a few trees growing for 15 to 20 years, just like pollution during and after construction. impact on tourism. I've got to mention this last point. Why would anyone want to come to this region

1:03:23

as the entire area is going to be a construction site for so many years to come. This and this point here. Yeah, that bringing the cable routes across the landing point and constructing a whole rule the size of motorway across Greenfield sites, and local habitats in thorpeness, ordering them and other beautiful villages. I could go on longer. But I would like to thank you for the opportunity to explain some of the reasons why I think this project should not be allowed to proceed in its current form. There are better, more appropriate sites, or the technologies better design sites, which we mentioned last night that can reduce the environmental impact and the more sustainable ways to deliver a carbon neutral UK and doing it in a way that strategic strategic thinking and not pushing through a proposed development of this type. And the last point is As the old saying goes, marry in haste and repent at leisure. We don't want our children to have to look at this or our grandchildren in years to come and look back on it and say why was this allowed to happen? Thank you very much.

1:04:22

Thank you very much Mr. Carlaw.

1:04:25

Okay, are good to move on to the next speaker this afternoon, which is Mr. Trevor? Collett.

1:04:40

Can you hear me?

1:04:42

Yes, I can hear you and see you Mr. Collett. You have five, five minutes this afternoon. Mr. Williams will give you a reminder when you have one minute remaining remaining. If you could just remember to introduce yourself at the beginning of your speaking slot. And you can begin whenever you're ready.

1:04:59

Thank you very much My name is Trevor Allen collett. I am a resident of rubra. And today I will be urging the committee to reject this application. I'm most grateful to the planning Inspectorate for allowing me the opportunity to express my views today. Although I would like it noted that I did experience some difficulty hearing all the speakers last night, as my screen froze on a number of

occasions. But what I did here was some very polite and reasoned representations for many hours to run conservation projects in the region, in support of the soft Wildlife Trust and the RSPB. I do think the committee should be around the behind this veneer of politeness is a growing anger, that companies who irresponsibly start to unravel all the environmental work that people people have undertaken over many years. So I'd like to make some observations that I would ask be taken into account when making a decision on this application. First, the Prime Minister announced on Tuesday that by 2030, lives have to be powered by wind. And putting aside the question of whether this is technically achievable, what is what is to be commended, is that he said this power will be delivered without guilt, and without damage to the environment. I trust that in the light of this statement, spr and the National Grid will withdraw their application in support of the Prime Minister's commitment, as clearly their proposals cannot be delivered without damage to our local environment. Second, Boris Johnson recently signed the leaders pledge for nature, and set out his ambitious plans for preserving 400,000 Hectors of our country's open spaces. Again, I think it is clear to us all that the impact of this application is not compatible with these aims. And third, the Natural History Museum recently published its state of nature report, which shows that of all the g7 countries shamefully, we are at the bottom of the league for preserving biodiversity is abundantly clear that this proposed development would cause yet further biodiversity loss. Now, it is Against this background that we openly criticize other nations for destroying the world's rainforests. But if we, in our quest for low carbon energy, were to permit this development, and its consequent destruction of arable land, Friston and damage to the sanderlings thorpeness cliffs and suffix Lee's legally designated area of outstanding natural beauty 10 as a nation, we could quite rightly be accused of gross hypocrisy. And I don't think I'm being melodramatic when I say that this land forms part of our rain forest, as eloquently demonstrated by one of the speakers last night, and therefore it must be protected. In this era of global food shortages, rainforest destruction, biodiversity loss, COVID-19, and the evident need for people to be able to enjoy open spaces for the benefit of their physical and mental well being. The prime minister is right to say that we should not be allowing the destruction of our environment in the pursuit of green wind energy. Furthermore, it is a gross misrepresentation by the companies concerned to promote a wind energy as green if to enable it to be delivered. They consciously allow the destruction of large areas of our precious landscape. And of course, the fact is, and in my view, this is the key issue. There are realistic alternative means of feeding sprs offshore energy into the national grid that would totally avoid this permanent environmental damage. Yes, the alternatives may be less convenient. And yes, they may be more expensive. But this is the price we have to pay if we are to protect our country's biodiversity and the health of our nation. Put simply, the need to protect sufferings valuable environment is infinitely more important than convenience and profit. And therefore, I urge the planning Inspectorate to dismiss this application and demonstrate support for the Prime Minister's aim to deliver wind energy without damage to the environment. Thank you.

1:10:00

Thank you very much, Mr. Collette. And just before you leave us, I'm very sorry to hear that you had problems last night listening to the live stream just to let you know that all of all of these hearings this week are being recorded. And those recordings will be posted up on the national infrastructure website on our project page in the next few days. So if you have to have the time, you should be able to watch that that back to catch anything that you might have missed

1:10:27

a good video.

1:10:28

Okay.

1:10:33

Okay, have we got Mr. Richard Cooper with us, please? I'm here.

1:10:42

Good afternoon, Mr. Cooper.

1:10:45

Good afternoon.

1:10:47

Mr. Cooper, you also have five minutes this afternoon. And Mr. Williams will give you a reminder when you have one minute left. And if I can just ask you to introduce yourself at the beginning of your slot as well please.

1:10:59

Thank you.

1:11:02

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm Richard Cooper. I'm a resident of A12. And we're about seven and a half miles to the west of Friston. my starting point is that I do not believe that the onshore elements of the scottishpower renewables project should go ahead under any circumstances. It's an ill thought out project. It's the result of an abject failure to develop a timely national energy policy, and it would be hugely visually intrusive in a rural landscape. I can't be accused of nimbyism as your element isn't strictly in my backyard. But I feel deeply for the residents of Friston. They're going to have to live with an industrial scale development in an intrinsically rural setting. But as a born and bred resident of East Suffolk, I have a wider concern than just Friston, potentially at the same time as scottishpower. Developing the substations, EDF will be constructing size We'll see. And malford will experience not only the scottishpower traffic but the huge uplift in HDB traffic from the works that size will see and the traffic generated by the ADF Southern Park and Ride between hatches and miles bird. So this is a perfect storm for he suffered. And we're being asked to pay a completely unreasonable price in order to benefit the rest of the country. I have four points to make today. Turning first to transport and highways on a busiest day in 2028. Scottish power is expected to contribute an additional 230 HGV movements per day, but miles furred over a predicted base number in 2028. of 922 HDV movements 25% increase over the predicted base for the year is bad enough, but add to it the additional thousand plus HGTV HGTV movements associated with signs We'll see. That's 144% increase in HTTP traffic. Not over today, but over a predicted day in 2028. And there'll be 200 bus movements per day from the southern park and ride on abnormal divisible loads, there's a distinct lack of detail detail on how they'll be handled. They have the potential to be hugely disruptive on a fragile road network. And for each sample of mouth for there's a bridge over the river or which would potentially need strengthening to take AI

ELLS or suggestions of compulsory purchase of adjacent land and property and the creation of a laid down area. And the lay down area is in an area identified by the environment agent see as flood zone three, in other words, high risk. Now I know that Mr. Hockley made another company site visit two miles for bridge on the 16th of July. And I hope that gate that visit gave him an opportunity to consider not only the bridge and the lay down side, but also the inadequacy of the unimproved a 12 at that point.

1:14:42

moving quickly on to cumulative impact in the case of Friston, which I I refer to as mission Creek. In terms of Friston site, there's a real concern that once the precedent has been set in this location, it'll be used for the site of the euro link and Nautilus interconnect two substations, the galloper and the great gangboard wind farms will be extended. And it seems likely that Friston will be selected for their substations, we must stop this potential for mission creep. Now. I agree with the other speakers who comment on commented on the visual and landscape Impact Assessment 15 years, I think it's wholly inadequate. And I think as well on the subject of noise, that to describe the noise impact at night as being negligible, or have no impact, grossly understate the the position. And I think that this is a particular area that needs to be revisited by the applicant. To conclude, I'm absolutely in favor of wind generated power, and I welcome the heat advances that have happened over recent years. So the Scottish power project objectives as a whole are laudable, but simply cannot support their own onshore element.

1:16:14

You to to, to to end on this sentence

1:16:17

finding last last sentence. That said, I recognize that if and I hope this doesn't happen, the onshore project area goes ahead, project goes ahead. There must be the very best mitigation put in place, which is not just window dress ting on the part of the applicant, but a genuine effort to address the concerns of the separate residence. Ladies and gentlemen, I look forward to contributing in more detail during the examination. Thank you.

1:16:46

Thank you very much, Mr. Cooper, just to let you know that we are going to carry out more unaccompanied site inspections and it is our intention that our traffic lead will be again visiting miles fed. Thank you.

1:17:02

Thank you very much.

1:17:06

Okay, next on my list, I have Miss Fiona cramb.

1:17:14

Hello, can you see me and hear me?

1:17:16

Yes, I can hear you see you very well, Mrs. Cramb. And Cramb , you have five, five minutes this afternoon and Mr. Williams will put a slide up when you have one minute remaining. I could just remind you to introduce yourself as well. Thank you very much lovely.

1:17:31

Okay. Good afternoon, Mr. Smith panel, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Fiona cramb and my home is as

1:17:39

it is situated on Friston more right on the perimeter of the substation site. I'm very grateful for the opportunity to speak to you today. But I do want to register my objection to the holding of these hearings virtually. By conducting these meetings in this way the community has been deprived the powerful opportunity to convey on mass the enormous strength of opposition to these applications. Scottish power and national grid's plans will have an already have had a hugely detrimental effect on us and our neighbors. And the recommendations you make to the Secretary of State will affect us not just for years, but almost certainly for the rest of our lives. As a result of the cumulative projects that national grid seems set on allowing at the Friston side on the back of these schemes. The allocated time prevents me from raising many of the issues I would like to have spoken about but I'm grateful to an endorsed the submissions made by Michael Marnie, Fiona Gilmore, coffee, Marian fellows amongst others. So instead, I'm going to speak about the impact directly on our family. Like many others. The first we heard about these plans was two years ago, when stage three of the so called consultation was nearing its end. Very quickly, the Friston site was selected and since then, fighting this threat has been has dominated our lives. The emotional impact has been huge. We live daily with uncertainty and the prospect of losing the life we love and retirement we looked forward to this morning as most mornings I walked my dog around the circular footpath route, following ancient pilgrimage routes to fasten them back. This is something I will never be able to do again, if this project gets the Go ahead. This is a source of great sadness. Our home is a beautiful grade two listed 16th century farmhouse, one of the number of listed buildings that ring forest and more. from both the house and garden we have an uninterrupted view of the forest and church and the surrounding countryside.

Scottish power and National Grid now in 10th place a vast industrial structure between our house in the village decimating the tracks that have connected our house and others but over 500 years, we will be isolated and cut off our views last minute essays as well. Right when he describes the high level of distrust in Scottish power and national grid, the consultation was shambolic. And the behavior of the applicant has been best disingenuous. It was only very late during the consultation process that we discovered that there would be a huge amount of noisy 18 metre tall National Grid infrastructure built just 300 metres from the garden fence directly in front of our property, blocking our views to the church, I still fail to understand how we had gone almost through this whole process, and not actually being shown fundamental parts of what was proposed. Why is National Grid allowed to come in under the umbrella of Scottish power without having to make its intentions playing. This is symptomatic of the shadow but pivotal role played by national grid in this whole process in their application. Scottish power has the temerity to suggest that the impact on our property and its heritage value will be minimal. The idea that we will not be blighted by noise and light pollution when the stations are built is insulting. The

idea that mitigation will make it all right is equally absurd. The idea and I quote that the projects are unlikely to have a significant impact on human health is objectionable. They even claim that the installations are cited away from population areas. This is frankly ridiculous. I try not to imagine what the next few years will bring these plans go ahead as it is profoundly depressing. We know that scottishpower National Grid are planning to use the Friston site for a series of their successive infrastructures, I ask you to consider what this means for my family and others who also live in the houses which is inside the circle this tightly constrained sight. We face the prospect of decades of building work and an arc of construction slicing through the village in the countryside. The truth is that if consent is given Friston will be blighted by heavy construction, traffic, noise, dust smell for the rest of our lives. The village and countryside that was to have been a tranquil sanctuary for our last few years will be a heaving industrial complex. We do not oppose renewable energy and we do not oppose wind farms. But the idea that SPR can seek to claim a moral high ground and claim green credentials, when they have chosen to despoil a medieval village is pure hypocrisy. These stations are not intended to serve the local population, there is no benefit to us. There are many other brownfield sites that could have been chosen and there are other technologies that could have been avoided to use to avoid ruining the countryside. Whilst we welcome the base review it appears that these projects have been deliberately excluded. Finally, I would refer you to Dermot Nolan former head of off gems comments in today's digital Times newspaper. He describes the present method of each wind farm having its own connection as outdated, politically unacceptable, costly and unfit for delivering on the government's renewable targets. He suggests that there should be a full scale review of offshore infrastructure, a fully independent body should replace national grid and instead of hundreds of cables going ashore and offshore grid should be built, which would not only say huge areas of our country size, but could save 6 billion by 2050. Finding it appears our voices are being heard. Thank you.

1:23:16

Thank you very much, Miss Graham, that was just at the beginning that you did disclose some personal information and data. Are you happy, you are aware that we are recording and you're happy with that?

1:23:29

Yes, that's fine.

1:23:30

That's fine. And I do believe my colleague Mr. Hockley has a quick question for you as well.

1:23:37

Thank Thank you, Mrs. Jones. Miss Cramb, thank you very much for your representation there. Early on, you're so you mentioned your property. And I know, I know, the comments in your relevant representation about your property as well. If you have any, any more details about the history of your, your list of property, if you can submit it, but those by deadline, one that will be most useful for us. Thank you.

1:23:59

Yes. And I think if you are coming to make a visit, one of the things that we concerned about is that the viewpoints that scottishpower rely on are not the viewpoints from our property. They have points right on the corner doesn't show the impact on our property at all.

1:24:13

Okay, thank you very much. Thank you.

1:24:16

And finally, just before you go, Miss cramb, and you did make reference, your Dermot Nolan reference. Yeah. Digital times. Could you make sure that you submit anything that you have referred to this afternoon? In your representation by deadline one? Yeah, of course. Thank you very much.

1:24:34

Thank you.

1:24:40

Okay, well, final speakers for session one are Patricia and Steven Dorsey.

1:24:48

Yes, hello. Yes.

1:24:49

Hello, Mr. Mrs. Dorsey.

1:24:53

Yeah, CMT.

1:24:56

We have to introduce ourselves. Yeah.

1:25:01

sighs Well,

1:25:03

thank you just before you start, like seven, seven minutes this afternoon, Mr. Williams will put a slide on the screen when you have one minute remaining and yes, if you can introduce yourselves just as you begin to speak, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

1:25:19

Okay. Hello.

1:25:22

Good afternoon, sir. Mrs. Patricia Dorsey and my husband, Steven Dorsey living sighs Well,

1:25:28

yeah, we live in a size Well, we live perhaps 300 to 400 yards back from the beach. And we live behind sizewell Hall in a little group of cottages, very, very tranquil. And, hey, presto, we learned that the cable route is likely to come is going to come as near as 16 meters as far as we can ascertain, from the closest cottage that will be to the cable route from our group of cottages. Now, myself and my two adjacent neighbors. Both are sorry, all three of us suffer quite badly with chest problems, heart problems. Having said that, because I'm struggling a bit at moment, I'm going to hand over to my good lady wife.

1:26:24

Okay, yes, my husband is correct in saying he's struggling a little bit with his, his breathing due to the fact we've had a lot of wet weather doesn't help his his issues. But as he rightly says he's very concerned about the close proximity that the cable routes that scottishpower renewables are supposedly going to be putting through. The worst part of it is that they're going to use it as a whole road for the entire build. Now, as he rightly said, my husband, we're very close to saltless, which is the landfall, they will be using the cable route 60 meters approximately from our properties for the entire time to locate the land for the compound that will be to associate it with the works for bringing in all the cabling. We have experienced greater Gabbard and galloper, both the projects, and we know what is entailed. Now, the actual dust that will be produced from all of this movement of the haulage going through for the entire of this build, of which we don't know how long that's going to be, will mean the breathing difficulties and the heart issues that our neighbors and my husband suffers will be accentuated, and there's no measures that can be put in place to ensure that the dust will not be an issue. While this development takes place. scottishpower renewables have said they will dampen down the whole road, that's not a helpful place to start. If they dampen down the hallways, they will probably have to use water extracted from the main supply from our location. This will affect the already pour water pressure that we experience gathered and galloper extracted a lot of water while they were doing their projects. And on many occasions, all eight properties were cut off from water entirely. We had a lot of issues with them. Now, at this point, I could read back what scottishpower renewables gave us as information regarding the cable route, it has to be 200 meters away from the special protected area that lies to the west of our properties. Therefore bringing it so close to our properties. Now they will not be able to mark out the route of the cable at this particular time as we requested, not until the contractors are in place. That will not happen till the dcl has been passed or Road Traffic they cannot give us any information on the vehicle movements on the whole road. Once the vehicles have accessed the onshore development area I off of lovers lane. They have freedom of movement along the whole road. This in turn will reduce to the amount of vehicles on the roads fine still doesn't help us we don't know how many are going to be passing from seven o'clock in the morning to seven o'clock at night and the dust issues that this will present. They did say that the heaviest time for the traffic will be when they are setting up and D mobilizing. Okay. Well we've had a lot of analyzing with Richard tricker, who was actually the town councilor at the time down at Boise. And he said there was a huge issue when they were Actually constructing the whole road. That was the worst time for them. But there have had many issues over the entire time that I've been building they have finally finished for the time being obviously they've got to come back when they do East Anglia three to bring the cable route through. Now, I have to just digress a little bit at this moment, because East Anglia one and East Anglia three had the work done at the same time. Now Jonathan Pope and managing director of actually stated in 2019.

1:30:37

Speaking before the Stanger hub announcement, Jonathan Cole said what we have done with East Anglia, one is to build all the onshore infrastructure for both East Anglia, one and East Anglia three at the same time, in order to do that work once, not twice. So minimize construction disruption to the local community. And our plans for the other two sites, East Anglia, one North and East Anglia two is to do a very similar thing, building them together to minimize disruption, I really do sincerely hope that that will be the case because scottishpower renewables at the moment, will not actually commit to that. Now, I know we've only got seven minutes, and I'm not being a newbie here. Because where we live, okay, we're gonna be hugely disrupted. But so will all our wildlife. We have red deer that roam very freely, all around the area where we live, we're very, very lucky to have that. We also have badgers. We also have lots of birds, including, obviously, you've got nightingales, which are beautiful to hear. But we have also the soaring birds in the sky. And I can't remember what they're called at the moment skylarks, and yet we do have Woodlands as well. Now, we feel like we're guardians for these animals, we have to try and cherish where they are. We're lucky enough to live here. They forage and they survive here. They leave, they will move away, they probably will never come back. I have no idea. I'd like to think that won't be the case. But obviously, if we can hope this project, and this cable route does not come through this area, and ruin the cable, the cable route goes through what is like a wildlife corridor. And if this is disrupted to the point where they move away, then we've lost all of what we're here for. We love the area of tranquility and the wildlife and it will be gone. Now and then.

1:32:47

Can I just ask you to

1:32:47

some to sum up? Yes, of course. I would certainly well, national adventures are planning to come in with Nautilus and yearling galloper and gallop Gabbard are planning to extend their set. So basically, can they just all go away? I did ask them to go away at the very beginning of the consultations, but they're still here.

1:33:12

Oh, thank you very much. Thank you very much, Mr. Mrs. Dorsey. And just before we move on, again, at the beginning of your speaking notes, you did mention that your husband had health issues. Now obviously, we did say that this is recorded. Are you happy for that information to have been recorded? Yeah, that's fine. That's fine. Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much

1:33:37

for your time.

1:33:38

And we've got one more thing. And now obviously, we did. We did combine your speaking slots, because the panel's decided to give households, seven minutes so that we could try and hear from as many different people as possible. It is our intention, if people would still like their individual slots to give you priority in the January open floor hearings, if you both still would like an individual slot.

1:34:03

And that's very common. I think we take on that.

1:34:06

Yes. That's great. Thank you. And just before you go, my colleague, Mr. Rigby has something he would like to ask. Okay.

1:34:16

Yes, thank you. Good afternoon. Mr. Dorsey. You mentioned in your submission just now, statements by a bedrolls, chief executive, Jonathan Cole, relation to previous projects and the intention on this project. I'd be very grateful if when you put in your written representation for what you've just said that you could include a proper reference, please. That would be very useful for us.

1:34:46

It certainly will do that. Thank you very much, indeed. Thanks. Well, thank you. Thank you.

1:34:50

Thank you very much. Okay, well, I've now reached the end of the list of speakers and agenda items to and we've reached the end of session one, this time. Afternoon, can I just take this opportunity to thank everyone very much for your contributions, which we will consider with great care. And I remind you that as you've already spoken, and we do need to make space in the computer system for the next round of speakers, you should now leave the hearing. If you want to carry on watching it, please do switch over to the live stream available from the national infrastructure planning website. You can watch there without affecting the network capacity available for the speakers in the following sessions. Just while we're on the subject of the live stream, just to let everybody know if you are having any problems in getting that started, it may be useful to press the refresh button at the start of the next session. The joining process for session two starts at 340 shortly and the session itself starts at 4pm. I will now adjourn this hearing to session two. Thank you